

**2002 Proposed
Comprehensive Plan
Amendments
Executive's Report and
Recommendations**



City of Seattle

Department of Design, Construction & Land Use

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000

Seattle, WA 98104-5070

(206) 684-8850 • FAX (206) 233-7883

2002 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments Executive's Report and Recommendations

October 2, 2002

Introduction	1
Analysis of Proposed Amendments	5
1. Future Land Use Map	5
2. "Urban Center-Oriented Development/Urban Village-Oriented Development"	7
3. Function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Residential Urban Villages	11
4. Sustainable Building Policy	17
5. Sustainability Policies	19
6. Public Stairways	21
7. Housing Policies	25
8. Watershed Plans	29
9. Capital Facilities Appendix D – Not included in legislation	31

ATTACHMENT

- A. City Council Resolution 30446, identifying proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments to be considered for possible Adoption in 2002

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Executive's Recommended 2002 Annual Amendments to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, including an evaluation and recommendation for each proposed amendment. The Growth Management Act limits amending the Comprehensive Plan to once each year except for specific actions. Resolution 30412 outlines the process for the submittal and review of proposed amendments to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. Resolution 30412 establishes a two-step process to consider annual amendments.

The first step was the initial determination of which proposed amendments to consider further in 2002. This determination was made by the City Council in May after public notice, a hearing and Committee consideration. The City Council approved Resolution 30446 identifying eight proposals to be considered as potential amendments to the Comprehensive Plan this year and three proposals to be considered in 2003.

The 2002 proposals are:

Land Use Element

- Amend Land Use Policy L53 to clarify the intent of the Future Land Use Map
- Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages

Land Use and Transportation Elements

- Review the proposal concerning public stairways.

Housing Element

- Review Housing Element policies (including but not limited to H37, H38 and H40) for possible changes, including but not limited to policies governing the allocation of rental housing funding by income levels served, the scope of programmatic and geographic exceptions to those policies, the City's objectives regarding owner-occupancy, and the geographic targeting of assistance for both rental housing and home ownership, as well as technical clarification.

Housing and Neighborhood Planning Elements

- Consider substituting terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for "transit-oriented development".

Capital Facilities Element

- Develop language more clearly embodying the City's sustainable building policy

Environmental

- Review the City's sustainability policies (to be done by the Office of Sustainability and Environment)
- Examine existing watershed plans and investigate the legal ramifications of recognizing a watershed plan in the Comprehensive Plan. Clarify exactly what type of watershed plans could be subject to such recognition.

Over the summer, these proposals have been reviewed and analyzed. For this second stage of the process, the Executive is now recommending amendments to the City Council for its consideration.

As part of the 2002 budget process, potential amendments to Capital Facilities Appendix D were identified. These potential amendments were included in the public hearing notice, but were not included in the legislation forwarded to the City Council by the Executive. City Councilmembers may introduce these proposed amendments as part of their deliberation.

In response to the eight proposals currently under consideration, the following amendments are recommended for adoption this year:

Land Use Element

- Amend Policy L53 to clarify the intent of the Future Land Use Map, the Official Land Use Map and the rezone criteria in the Land Use Code.
- Amend Policy L303's existing language regarding protecting urban trails from encroachment to include publicly owned stairways.

Transportation Element

- Add a new policy T47a to recognize the importance of public stairways in the City's pedestrian transportation network.

Housing Element

- Take specific affordability and geographic focus standards out of Comprehensive Plan policies H37 and H38 and refer to the Consolidated Plan for these specifics.
- Substitute the word "maintain" relating to the City's owner-occupancy rate with "increase" in Policy H38 and change other wording to better reflect the City's current efforts to increase homeownership.

Capital Facilities Element

- Add a new goal, CFG8, to clearly state the City's sustainable building goals as they relate to capital facilities development and maintenance. Remove policy CF13 and replace it with a new section 5: "Sustainable Building Practices" and add six new policies (CF19-CF24) to flesh out the City's policies regarding sustainable building.

Environment Element

- Add a new section to the Environment Element, containing a list of "Additional Resources" including the City's plans for the Piper's Creek and Longfellow Creek watersheds.

The Executive recommends that the City Council pursue future work programs for two proposed amendments:

Land Use Element

- Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages.

Environment Element

- Review by the City's Office of Sustainability and the Environment of the City's sustainability policies in 2003 with proposed amendments in late 2003 and/or early 2004.

One amendment is not recommended for adoption.

Housing and Neighborhood Planning Elements

- Consider substituting terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for "transit-oriented development".

Next Steps

A public hearing on the proposed amendments is scheduled for **4:30, November 4, 2002**. The City Council Land Use Committee will discuss and make recommendations on the recommended amendments in meetings in November. The full City Council will consider the Committee's report and take action later in the fall. All meetings will be held in City Council Chambers, 11th Floor, Municipal Building, 600 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104. Notice of the meetings has been placed in the Daily Journal of Commerce and the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU) Land Use Information Bulletin, and in the Department of Neighborhoods' Community Calendar.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

1. Future Land Use Map

Proposed amendment:

Amend Land Use Policy L53 to read as follows:

L53 The Future Land Use Map shows categories of land use that are preferred for generalized geographic areas across the city. Location of specific zones are shown on the City's zoning map. The criteria for siting those zones, which are found in the Land Use Code, are intended to reflect the policies of this plan and the general direction shown on the Future Land Use Map. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map.

Element: Land Use

Submitted by: Strategic Planning Office/DCLU

Description of the proposed amendment:

Existing language regarding the role of the Future Land Use Map and the role of the land use criteria has proved to be confusing to analysts considering proposed rezones. The conditions under which an amendment to the Future Land Use Map would be required have not been clearly drawn within the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment would help to clarify the role of the Future Land Use Map in directing the location of zones and land use categories.

All rezones require that the proposed new zone be consistent with the City's rezone criteria contained within the Land Use Code. The City has viewed the Future Land Use Map as a generalized vision of the future configuration of different land use categories throughout the City. Rather than showing where land use categories are to be located at a parcel level, the map is intended to show the general mix and configuration of land uses within areas. Therefore, where a single property is proposed to be rezoned to an adjacent zone, an amendment to the map is generally not required. When considering rezones of small areas from one land use category to a land use category abutting the area, the City has not required an amendment to the Future Land Use Map. However, where proposed rezones would change an area from one general land use category to another, and the rezoned area would not abut areas having the same general land use category, future land use map amendments are required.

The proposed land use code amendment helps to clarify that the zoning criteria in the land use code drive most rezones. However, it is not entirely clear about when one would use the future land use map. The recommended language, below, would provide clearer direction in when to use the Comprehensive Plan for rezones and when to use the rezone criteria.

Recommended action:

Replace the proposed amendment with the following recommended language, which provides a set of directions for when to use the Future Land Use Map and when to use the Land Use Code and zoning map:

L53: Use the Future Land Use Map and the goals and policies included in this plan to identify general locations where broad categories of land uses are preferred. Use the City's Official Land Use Map and rezone criteria included in the Land Use Code to identify the location of specific zones, which implement the goals and policies of this plan. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

Clearer language is desired regarding when the Future Land Use Map is used. The recommended language would identify when the future land use map is used and when rezone criteria and the City's zoning map are used when considering a request for a rezone.

2. “Urban center-oriented development/urban village-oriented development”

Proposed Amendment:

Substitute the terms “urban center-oriented development” and “urban village-oriented development” for the too narrow term “transit-oriented development” in any city policy relating to Urban Centers and urban villages

Elements: Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Submitted by: Thomas Heller

Description of the proposed amendment:

The proposed amendment would change the words “transit-oriented” to “urban center-oriented” or “urban village-oriented” in two goals and five policies in six adopted neighborhood plans. In addition, the phrase appears in one Housing Element policy. These goals and policies are listed below.

The phrase “transit-oriented development” refers to development that is centered around and coordinated with a transit station in its use and design. The intent of TOD is to establish land uses and to design structures and public areas that will encourage people to ride transit more often. Typically, a TOD project has the following physical characteristics: a mix of uses, compact development, all locations within walking distance of transit, neighborhood focal points at a transit station, and a pedestrian orientation.

There are a number of similarities between TOD development as it has been envisioned nationwide and the City of Seattle’s Urban Village strategy. Urban villages, like TODs, are intended to be mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented areas, often with densities and designs that encourage people to reduce their use of automobiles. The key difference between TODs and urban villages is one of orientation to transit facilities. TODs are always envisioned as new development that is specifically designed to relate to transit stations. Urban villages may or may not focus development and services at a transit station. Existing urban villages are often served by networks of bus lines, without a concentration of development at a transit station.

Each of the neighborhood plans using the phrase “transit-oriented development” refers specifically to how development occurs in relation to proposed transit improvements. All of the neighborhood plan goals and policies which use the phrase “transit-oriented development” are for neighborhoods which will contain a light rail station. These neighborhoods, planning for major new transit facilities, used the term “transit-oriented development” to refer to development that is planned for and built in relation to light rail stations proposed for their neighborhoods.

The Housing element policy is less explicit about the relationship between potential zoning changes and transit systems than are the neighborhood plans’ policies. However, this policy was amended in 2000, in the context of the 5-year Comprehensive Plan update. As part of this update, Council directed:

“Include in the Housing Element policies that describe the City's housing role within the regional context; incentives for housing production and *the coordination of housing development with planning focused on identified light rail stations.*” (italics added)

In response to this direction the sentence “Consider expanding the use of incentive zoning for affordable housing in neighborhoods outside downtown, particularly in relation to transit-oriented development.” was added to Housing Policy H30. This policy, thus, was amended with development focused on transit stations in mind.

Recommended action: Do not adopt the proposed amendment.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The existing language appears to more clearly reflect the intention to focus development or incentives at high-capacity transit stations than the broader terms “urban village-oriented development” would. Changing the language in these policies could significantly broaden the focus of the goals and policies, potentially beyond the neighborhoods’ or City’s intention.

The Executive would be concerned about changing the language in six neighborhood plans without neighborhood involvement in the change. However, if the Council does want to propose a change to the language in these neighborhood policies, removing the phrase “transit-oriented” from each of these policies would retain the meaning of most of the policies, while removing the focus on transit systems.

If the Council wants to clarify the language in Policy H30, the Executive recommends substituting the phrase “particularly in areas near high-capacity transit stations” for the phrase “particularly in relation to transit-oriented development.”

Goals and Policies Using the Term “Transit-Oriented Development”

HOUSING ELEMENT

- H30 Promote the continued production and preservation of low-income housing through existing incentive zoning mechanisms, which include density and height bonuses and the transfer of development rights. Consider expanding the use of incentive zoning for affordable housing in neighborhoods outside downtown, particularly in relation to transit-oriented development. Allow for new or different incentive zoning provisions designed to produce or preserve low-income housing in downtown if they are adopted as part of neighborhood or subarea plans or where needed to achieve housing development goals.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING ELEMENT

CAPITOL HILL

- CH-P6 Support integration of transit-oriented development with local transportation and open space improvements.

COLUMBIA CITY

- CC-G2 A community served by a light rail transit system which also is a catalyst for transit-oriented housing and commercial development within the station area.
- CC-P15 Strive to maintain existing neighborhood scale and character and promote transit-oriented development, where appropriate.

MLK@HOLLY

- MLK-G3 The Sound Transit light rail station forms the heart of a transit-oriented, mixed-use town center.

NORTH RAINIER

- NR-P1 Recognize the "Town Center" as the area where the neighborhood would like to use land use and zoning designations that facilitate transit-oriented development to assemble and finance the type of development envisioned by the neighborhood around the light rail station, and strive to facilitate the vitality of existing businesses that help meet the neighborhood's employment goals.

RAINIER BEACH

- RB-P2 Seek to promote transit-oriented development around Rainier Beach's proposed light rail station at Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and South Henderson Street.

ROOSEVELT

- R-P29 Encourage development of a light rail station and transit links that will support transit oriented development within the zoned capacity of the neighborhood's commercial core.

3. Function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Residential Urban Villages

Proposed amendment:

Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages – and clarify their intended inter-relationship(s), from the stand point of a) economic function (residential, commercial, employment) and b) physical interconnectedness by transportation facilities.

Elements: Land Use

Submitted by: Thomas Heller

Description of the proposed amendment:

The City has five different designations for areas expected to accommodate significant housing and/or employment growth over the 20 years covered by the Comprehensive Plan. Two of these designations (Urban Center and Manufacturing/Industrial Center) are countywide designations. Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers were first designated through the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the Comprehensive Plan's discussion of these designations follows the language in the CPPs. The other three designations are Seattle-specific designations (Urban Center Villages within Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Residential Urban Villages). These designations are intended to identify these areas' expected levels of residential and employment growth over the life of the Comprehensive Plan and their relationship to regional transportation networks.

In submitting this proposed amendment, Mr. Heller noted that when asked, “just exactly what IS an urban village?” Seattle planning officials were not able to provide a clear answer. He anticipates that clarity regarding the intended function of urban villages will help guide review of proposed projects, bring the City's zoning code better in line with the Comprehensive Plan, and “aid in communicating to the general public ‘what the big picture’ is as it happens in their communities.”

The most concise description of the different designations' intended economic function can be found in Policy L4:

Recognize and promote appropriate mixes of activity and intensities of development within areas accommodating growth and indicate whether residential or employment related activities are to be emphasized according to the intended function of the following urban village designations:

- Urban centers, and the urban villages within them, are intended to be the densest areas with the widest range of land uses.
- Hub urban villages are also intended to accommodate a broad mix of uses, but at lower densities than center villages, at intensities appropriate to the stage of development of the area.
- Residential urban villages are intended for concentrations of low to moderate densities of predominantly residential development with a compatible mix of support services and employment.

In addition to this description of their intended function, Urban Center Villages are assigned “functional designations” under policy L23. These functional designations indicate whether uses in a particular urban center village are intended to be primarily residential, mixed with a residential emphasis, mixed residential and employment, or mixed with an employment emphasis.

Descriptions of the areas' intended relationships to the regional and local transportation networks is found in the descriptions of the criteria to be used in designating the different types of urban centers and villages:

Designation as an **Urban Center** is appropriate for areas with "Accessibility to the existing regional transportation network, with access to the regional high capacity transit system to be provided in the future." (Policy L18)

Hub Urban Villages are designated in areas that are generally characterized by "A strategic location in relation to both the local and regional transportation network, including: a high level of transit service, with the possibility of improved connections to future high capacity transit stations, connections to regional transportation facilities, routes accommodating goods movement, and connections to adjacent areas by pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities." (Policy L29)

A **Residential Urban Village** designation is considered for areas where: "2. The area is presently on the city's arterial network and is served by a transit route providing direct transit service to at least one center or hub village... 4. The area has the opportunity to be connected by bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities to adjacent areas and nearby public amenities." (Policy L34)

These policies appear to clearly enunciate the difference between the economic function of the different types of urban village. In addition, within the designation criteria are clear descriptions of how the different urban village categories are to be connected through the transportation network. Other policies, which discuss the differences among the urban village designations, are listed below.

More clarity and better communication about the function of urban villages and the urban village strategy appear to be needed. Since the neighborhood planning process was completed, the City has published a citizen's guide to the Comprehensive Plan. The Executive will work to enhance clarity in its communications about the urban village strategy and the role and function of urban villages.

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends taking another look at the role and function of urban centers and villages in 2004 as part of the 10-year Comprehensive Plan update process. At that time, the City will be considering how to accommodate an additional ten years worth of development, covering the period between 2014 and 2024. Amendment of policies describing the role and function of urban centers and villages as the primary tool for accommodating growth under the Comprehensive Plan would be most appropriate at that time.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The Comprehensive Plan currently contains a number of explanations of the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages, their intended economic function and their interconnectedness by transportation facilities. Additional language about the function of the various levels of urban villages would add redundancies to the Comprehensive Plan. If new language was not redundant to existing language, the new language could unintentionally result in a change in the nature and definition of urban centers and villages. This new language would not have had sufficient public discussion and input. That level of public discussion over the role of urban villages is appropriate for the 2004 update process.

Existing Goals and Policies Relating to the different Roles and Functions of Urban Centers and Villages

	Urban Center Villages	Hub Urban Villages	Residential Urban Villages
Goals for Areas	Identify and reinforce concentrations of employment and housing in locations that would support and have direct access to the regional high capacity transit system. (LG18)	Accommodate concentrations of housing and employment at strategic locations in the transportation system conveniently accessible to the City's residential population, thereby reducing work trip commutes. (LG22) Provide convenient locations for commercial services that serve the populations of the village, surrounding neighborhoods, the city and the region. (LG23) Accommodate concentrations of employment and housing at densities that support pedestrian and transit use and increase opportunities within the City for people to live close to where they work. (LG24)	Promote urban villages that function primarily as compact residential neighborhoods providing opportunities for a wide range of housing types and a mix of activities that support the residential population. Support densities in residential urban villages that support transit use. (LG25) Allow employment activity to the extent that it does not conflict with the overall residential function and character of the village, provided that a different mix of uses may be established through a neighborhood plan adopted by the City Council. (LG26)
Mix of Uses Appropriate to the Area	Each Urban Center Village is assigned a "functional designation." Functional designations are: 1. Primarily residential; 2. Mixed, with a residential emphasis; 3. Mixed residential and employment; and 4. Mixed, with an employment emphasis." (L23)	See goals, above.	See goals, above.
Share of job growth	The greatest share of job growth will be accommodated in Urban Centers – areas that already function as high density, concentrated employment centers with the greatest access to the	Additional job growth will also be distributed to hub urban villages throughout the city to promote additional employment concentrations in areas easily accessible to the surrounding residential population, thereby locating jobs closer to where people live. (Discussion, Page LU-27)	No job growth targeted to these areas.

	Urban Center Villages	Hub Urban Villages	Residential Urban Villages
	regional network. (Discussion, Page LU-27)		
Share of residential growth	The greatest share of residential growth will also be accommodated in Urban Centers, increasing opportunities for people to live close to work. (Discussion Page LU-27)	The next most significant share of residential growth will be distributed among the various hub and residential urban villages throughout the city in amounts compatible with the existing development characteristics of individual areas. (Discussion Page LU-27)	
Criteria For Designation			
Size of Area Appropriate for Designation	Area not exceeding one and one-half square miles (960 acres).(L18)	Permit the size of hub urban villages to vary according to local conditions, but limit their size so that most areas within the village are within a walkable distance of employment and service concentrations in the village.(L31)	Permit the size of residential villages to vary according to local conditions, but consider it generally desirable that any location within the village be within easy walking distance of at least one center of activity and services.(L38)
Neighborhood/ Land Uses	Clearly defined geographic boundaries that reflect existing development patterns, functional characteristics of the area and recognized neighborhood boundaries.(L18)	<p>Surroundings comprised primarily of residential areas that allow a mix of densities, and non-residential activities that support residential use.(L29)</p> <p>A broad range of housing types and commercial and retail support services either existing or allowed under current zoning to serve a local, citywide or regional market.(L29)</p> <p>Open space amenities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Direct access to either existing or potential public open spaces in the immediate vicinity, and➤ Accessibility to major open space resources in the general area via either existing or potential urban trails, boulevards, or other open space links, or anticipated major public investment in open space.(L29) <p>Consider for designation as hub urban villages</p>	<p>A broad range of retail services to serve the residential population either already exists or can be accommodated in the area at a central location generally accessible on foot.(L34)</p> <p>The area presently includes, or is adjacent to, open space available for public use, or opportunities exist to provide public open space in the future.(L34)</p> <p>Require that a residential urban village surround one or more centers of activity and services.(L37)</p> <p>Include among areas considered suitable for designation as residential urban villages those areas that possess the desired characteristics and infrastructure to support a moderately dense residential population and those areas that, while lacking infrastructure or other</p>

	Urban Center Villages	Hub Urban Villages	Residential Urban Villages
		areas ranging from those able to accommodate growth with minor changes and public investment to those requiring more extensive public investment where the potential exists to achieve desired village conditions through redevelopment over time. (L32)	characteristics of a residential urban village, warrant public investment to address inadequacies in order to promote a transition to a higher density residential neighborhood. (L39)
Zoning Characteristics	<p>Zoning that permits the amount of new development needed to meet the following minimum density targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A minimum of 15,000 jobs located within a half mile of a possible future high capacity transit station; ➤ An overall employment density of 50 jobs per acre; and ➤ An overall residential density of 15 households per acre.(L18) 	<p>Zoning that allows a mix of uses to accommodate concentrations of employment and housing. It may be appropriate to limit the mix of uses in some areas to provide for concentrations of either employment or housing.(L29)</p> <p>A minimum of one-third of the land area currently zoned to accommodate employment activity and/or mixed-use.(L29)</p> <p>Opportunities for redevelopment because of a substantial amount of vacant or under-utilized land.(L29)</p>	The area presently supports, or can accommodate under current zoning, a concentration and mix of residential development, at 8 to 15 units per gross acre on average, and at a small to moderate scale.(L34)
Transportation	Accessibility to the existing regional transportation network, with access to the regional high capacity transit system to be provided in the future.(L18)	<p>A strategic location in relation to both the local and regional transportation network, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ a high level of transit service, with the possibility of improved connections to future high capacity transit stations, ➤ connections to regional transportation facilities, ➤ routes accommodating goods movement, and ➤ connections to adjacent areas by pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.(L29) 	<p>The area is presently on the city's arterial network and is served by a transit route providing direct transit service to at least one center or hub village.(L34)</p> <p>The area has the opportunity to be connected by bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities to adjacent areas and nearby public amenities.(L34)</p>

4. Sustainable Building Policy

Proposed amendment:

Develop language more clearly embodying the City's sustainable building policy.

Elements: Capital Facilities (This was originally proposed as part of the Environmental Element.)

Submitted by: Resolution 30273/ 30446

Description of the proposed amendment:

Sustainable building is currently mentioned in two places in the Comprehensive Plan. Capital Facilities policy CF 13 currently states:

CF13 Strive to use resource-efficient building materials and techniques in new and refurbished City facilities and encourage other public agencies to follow similar sustainable building practices.

Environment Policy E6 currently states:

E6 Strive to design, construct, and operate City facilities to limit environmental impacts, such as by incorporating energy efficiency, water conservation, waste minimization, pollution prevention, or resource-efficient materials throughout a facility's life.

This language could be strengthened and improved in at least three ways.

- The existing language speaks only to the environmental components and benefits of sustainable building (e.g. energy and water efficiency, use of recycled products, etc.), but leaves out important social and economic benefits (e.g., cost savings, improved indoor environment, enhanced productivity, etc.)
- The existing language does not indicate the City's interest in (and efforts toward) promoting sustainable building practices in non-City projects (e.g., private development, low-income/affordable housing development, etc.)
- The existing language does not indicate the City's intention to apply sustainable building principles and practices to the design and construction of City-funded capital facilities that are not buildings, per se (e.g., roads/bridges, parks, drainage systems, etc.)

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends adding a new Capital Facilities goal, CFG8, as follows:

CFG8 Incorporate sustainability principles and practices into the design and construction of City buildings and other types of capital facilities.

The Executive recommends deleting Capital Facilities Policy CF13 and replacing it with a new section in the Capital Facilities Element, containing 5 new policies related to the sustainable design and construction of the City's Capital Facilities, as follows:

5. Sustainable Design and Construction

- CF19 Assess the sustainability of choices in developing capital projects, including finance, planning, design, construction, management, renovation, maintenance, and decommissioning.
- CF20 Consider environmental health in capital facilities development, including efficient use of energy, water, and materials; waste reduction; protection of environmental quality; and ecologically sensitive site selection and development.
- CF21 Consider social and human health in capital facilities development, including protection of worker health, improved indoor environmental quality, and access to alternative transportation modes (e.g., public transit, bicycling, walking, etc.) and social services.
- CF22 Consider economic health in capital facilities development, including purchase of products and services from locally owned businesses and support for local manufacture of sustainable products.
- CF23 Consider life-cycle cost analysis as a method to better understand the relative costs and benefits over time of alternative approaches to the design and construction of City buildings and capital facilities.
- CF24 Encourage public and private sector use of third-party sustainable building rating and certification systems, such as the Master Builder Association's BuiltGreen system and the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The proposed set of a new goal and new policies do a better job of enunciating the City's sustainable building policy. These new policies clarify the broad scope of issues that are encompassed in the concept of sustainable building. They indicate the City's interest in promoting sustainable building for non-City projects. Finally, they indicate the City's intention to incorporate sustainable building concepts into the broad range of Capital Facilities that the City develops and manages.

5. Sustainability Policies

Proposed amendment:

Review by the Office of Sustainability and Environment of the City's sustainability policies, with the goal of recommending any appropriate Comprehensive Plan Amendments in 2002.

Elements: All elements as appropriate

Submitted by: Resolution 30273

Description of the proposed amendment:

The proposal requests that the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) review the Comprehensive Plan in order to identify any amendments that would enhance the existing policies surrounding sustainability.

Recommended action:

Pursue a thorough review of sustainability concepts in the Comprehensive Plan through 2003 with recommendations to be considered as part of the 10-year Comprehensive Plan update in 2004.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan update process will constitute the 10-year review of the Comprehensive Plan. This major review of the Comprehensive Plan is expected to incorporate a broader review of the Comprehensive Plan and its goals and policies.

Completing this project in 2004 will ensure that the concept of sustainability provides a framework for the 10-year update of the Comprehensive Plan. Including a review of sustainability in the Plan as part of that process will provide an opportunity to undertake a more holistic review of the Plan and the concept of sustainability in it.

In 2004, a broader public process is expected to occur which would allow for a broader community discussion of the concepts of sustainability in the Plan than could be expected as part of the 2002 process.

6. Public Stairways

Proposed amendment:

To the Land Use Element's section D, "Open Space Network," add the following new section, "Public Stairways" after the section on "Urban Trails": Preserve the public outdoor stairways as valuable pedestrian connections and points of access to Seattle's open spaces and views. Public stairways may exist on land managed by Seattle Transportation, the Parks Department, City Light, and other City agencies; on land managed by WSDOT, the Port, and other public agencies; and on private land through easement and permit conditions. The City will maintain the public stairways, discourage vacations of their right-of-way, and consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, will seek to add or expand public stairways in desirable locations.

To the Transportation Element's Section H, "Pedestrians and Bicycles," add a new Public Stairways map (after the existing Transportation Figure 5, "Seattle Urban Trails System"). After Policy T44 (which deals with Urban Trails) add the following new policy: Designate the public outdoor stairways shown in the Public Staircases Map to facilitate walking as a viable transportation choice, link neighborhoods, walkways, trails, and open spaces, and provide access to views. Although most stairways are on City rights-of-way, some are on other public agencies' land, and some are on private land, with public access to them by easements, cooperative agreements or permit conditions. The City will maintain or restore the existing public stairways to good conditions. The City will control vegetation so that it does not block or damage the public stairways. The City will protect public stairways from private encroachments and will discourage vacations of public right-of-way occupied by public stairways. Consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City will seek to add or expand public stairways in desirable locations.

Elements: Land Use, Transportation

Submitted by: Chris Leman

Description of the proposed amendment:

This proposal seeks to amend the Land Use Element and the Transportation Element to recognize and establish policies for public stairways.

This proposal contains many elements:

- a proposed definition of "public stairways" that includes properties owned and managed by various entities;
- language addressing maintenance and restoration of stairways;
- policies to add or expand stairways and protect stairways from encroachment, and
- documentation of stairways through the development of a map similar to that which portrays the City's urban trail system.

Recommended action:

Transportation Element: Pedestrians and Bicycles

The Executive recommends the adoption of a new policy, T47a, as follows:

T47a Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment.

Land Use Element: Open Space Network

The Executive recommends inserting the following language (underlined) to L303.3:

L303 Include the following considerations in the design of trails:

3. Seek to protect existing trails and publicly owned stairways from encroachment by private development, including motor vehicle crossings, especially in residential neighborhoods where safety and aesthetic issues are paramount.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

While Seattle's stairways are part of Seattle's transportation infrastructure, they also are unique features of Seattle's hilly topography. Stairways located within City of Seattle rights-of-way are maintained and developed as part of the City's sidewalk system. Like all public rights-of-way, many stairways provide access to views and provide a pedestrian link between neighborhoods for those who are capable of navigating them. Seattle's stairways are also a unique feature of the city's urban landscape. Many stairways are located within forested areas, providing limited access to Seattle's informal open spaces.

As part of the city's transportation system, the inclusion of language in the Transportation Element makes sense. As a point of access into open spaces, references within the Open Space Network of the Land Use Element is logical.

The following table further discusses why and how various elements of the proposed amendment should/should not be adopted:

Proposed Language	Reasons for adopting/ not adopting specific proposed language
Stairways located on private property and land owned by other agencies	The Comprehensive Plan should cite only stairways owned and controlled by the City of Seattle. Most existing stairways are located within the street right of way. The City can broadly "encourage" the maintenance of stairways that are owned by other agencies. However, the City should not use the Comprehensive Plan to assert blanket control over property owned by other entities.
City to maintain or restore existing public stairways / control vegetation	Identifying the maintenance that should occur on specific pieces of City right-of-way is a work program item not appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan.
City to discourage vacations	This proposed language is consistent with the level of discussion addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.
Protect public stairways from private encroachment	This proposed language is consistent with the level of discussion addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.
Add or expand stairways in desirable locations	The design of pedestrian amenities is site-specific and may include stairways, as in the Wallingford Steps project. Specifying creating new stairways in the Comprehensive Plan could potentially lead to the City being required to create new stairways when resources for construction and/or demand for new facilities do not exist.
Stairways map	Do not include a stairways map. Data on the existence of stairways is very

	limited and would require constant updating. A map would be a separate work program, which currently is not funded.
Land Use Element or Transportation Element	If stairways are identified as part of the City’s sidewalk system—and therefore maintained by Seattle’s transportation department—they should be addressed in the Transportation element and their relationship to the open space network referenced in the Land Use Element.

7. Housing Policies

Proposed amendment:

Review Housing Element policies (including but not limited to H37, H38 and H40) for possible changes, including but not limited to policies governing the allocation of rental housing funding by income levels served, the scope of programmatic and geographic exceptions to those policies, the City's objectives regarding owner-occupancy, and the geographic targeting of assistance for both rental housing and home ownership, as well as technical clarification.

Elements: Housing

Submitted by: Resolution 30446

Description of the proposed amendment:

Two amendments to the Housing Policies H37 and H38 are recommended in response to this proposal:

1. Take specific affordability and geographic focus standards out of the Comprehensive Plan and refer to the Consolidated Plan for these specifics.
2. Substitute the word "maintain" the City's owner-occupancy rate with "increase" the City's owner-occupancy rate, and change other wording to better reflect the City's current efforts to increase homeownership.

Policy H40 is not proposed to be amended.

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends amending Policy H37 as follows:

H37 Public funds administered by the City and used for the purposes of affordable rental housing may be used only to serve income groups consistent with criteria contained in the Consolidated Plan. ~~the following criteria:~~

- ~~• At least 50% of rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of median income;~~
- ~~• Remaining rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households earning between 31 and 50% of median income consistent with fund source program affordability requirements;~~
- ~~• Renter households at or below 80% of median income may be served in the Central Area SOA, the Southeast SOA, the Southwest SOA, and the Pioneer Square and International District of the Downtown SOA for the purposes allowed in the SOA policies, or within half a mile of a light rail station or major transit center located outside downtown. CDBG and HOME funds may be used for this purpose.~~

~~The Rental Affordability Policy applies to all applicable Office of Housing administered capital fund sources combined and not to individual fund sources. The Policy applies to funding available in the City of Seattle biennial budget cycles (i.e. 2001-2002; 2003-2004).~~

~~Funding that does not meet the Rental Affordability Policy in the first year of a biennium must be brought into compliance by the end of the second year. The Rental Affordability Policy does not apply to programs where the City leverages other funds through credit~~

~~enhancement strategies; and Housing Levy rental production program, 50-65% of median set aside.~~

The Executive recommends amending Policy H38 as follows:

- H38 Help ~~maintain~~ increase the City's owner-occupancy rate and encourage home ownership in a variety of housing types by:
- a. Using a portion of local discretionary housing subsidy resources to provide home ownership opportunities to households consistent with affordability targets and geographic focus included in the City's Consolidated Plan. ~~with incomes below 80% of median income. Target funds primarily to neighborhoods with average household incomes below 80% of the City average; neighborhoods with high concentrations of assisted rental housing; and areas where upward pressure on prices may result in the displacement of existing residents.~~
 - b. ~~Consider~~ Setting aside a substantial portion of any new discretionary funding sources for assisted housing, such as a new housing levy, to provide homeownership opportunities to households with incomes below 80% of median income. Also, consider alternative approaches to increase the development of affordable homeownership housing, including but not limited to greater use of land trusts and limited equity cooperatives.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended actions:

Currently, the City has language describing the affordability levels to be targeted with City funds in two different locations: the Comprehensive Plan and the City's Consolidated Plan. This language has been identical in both documents, and is thus redundant. The Executive recommends using the Consolidated Plan as the document containing the affordability criteria for the use of City funds.

The Consolidated Plan provides a coordinated approach to addressing Seattle's human services, housing and community development needs. The goal of the Consolidated Plan is to integrate economic, physical and human development in a comprehensive fashion so that families and communities can thrive together. The Consolidated Plan is approved by the City Council and receives sufficient public review to ensure that the affordability criteria remain consistent with the community's goals and City Council established affordability criteria.

Policy H37 would be amended to delete the specific affordability policy language that is also contained in the Consolidated Plan. The language currently in the Consolidated plan would be changed to reflect recent Council adjustments to affordability made in the 2002 Housing Levy Ordinance. Comprehensive Plan language would refer to the Consolidated Plan for specific language on affordability. It is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan to acknowledge that there are affordability requirements and alert readers to their existence and location. Specific criteria, however, are detailed in the Consolidated Plan and do not need to be repeated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy H38 would be amended to say that the City intends to help "increase" the owner-occupancy rate as opposed to "maintain" the rate. "Increase" is more consistent with the City's goals as described in Goal HG8. The affordability level language and the geographic targeting language would be replaced with a reference to the Consolidated Plan where affordability and geographic areas for specific focus would be described.

8. Watershed Plans

Proposal:

Examine existing watershed plans and investigate the legal ramifications of recognizing a watershed plan in the Comprehensive Plan. Clarify exactly what type of watershed plans could be subject to such recognition.

Elements: Land Use, Environment, Neighborhood Planning

Submitted by: Resolution 30723

Description of the proposed amendment:

The principal purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide policies that guide the development of the City in the context of regional growth management. The plan is intended to be used by the City to help make decisions about proposed ordinances, policies, and programs. Under State law, the City must "... perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its Comprehensive Plan." Consequently, the City looks very carefully at the policies and language that it incorporates into the Comprehensive Plan.

Other plans adopted by the City Council by resolution are not held to the same high legal standard. Consequently, the City needs to be careful before incorporating them into the Comprehensive Plan. This is particularly true for "action plans" that set out a set of activities to meet City or community goals. Often these plans are to be implemented by a broad range of actors. Incorporating them into the Comprehensive Plan without careful review and editing could require the City to take actions that it could not either legally or financially undertake, or that are already being implemented by another party.

Plans that the City Council has not formally reviewed and adopted have generally not had sufficient review by the City's elected officials to ensure that they represent the City's goals or policies. For plans that the City wants to recognize, the first step would be City Council review and, if appropriate, adoption or recognition by resolution.

Three different types of watershed plans have been created that effect City activities have been identified.

1. Plans covering the largest areas are the Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) plans being developed by King County, with City participation. Seattle fits within two WRIs: WRIA 8, the Cedar River-Lake Washington Watershed, and WRIA 9, the Green-Duwamish River Watershed. WRIA 8 includes Lake Washington, Lake Union, Seattle's Puget Sound shoreline north of Elliott Bay, and the hillsides that drain into those waterways. WRIA 9 includes the Duwamish waterway, Seattle's Puget Sound Shoreline south of Elliott Bay and the hillsides that drain into those waterways. Both WRIs cover areas within the City of Seattle limits and in broad areas outside of the City.

The WRIA 9 Steering Committee published a *Final Near-Term Action Agenda* in May 2002. A *Draft Near-Term Action Agenda* was published by the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed Steering Committee for WRIA 8 in February 2002. These action agendas recommend near-term actions to help restore and protect habitat for chinook salmon and bull trout, which were listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act in 1999. The City has not officially recognized these action agendas. The action agendas are intended to provide guidance to local governments and interested organizations and citizens

on interim measures that can be undertaken while long-term conservation plans for salmon habitat in the watersheds are being developed. These long-term conservation plans have not yet been developed, and are not recommended for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan until they have been completed and the City Council has endorsed their proposals.

2. The City has developed a Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan. This plan covers the City-owned 90,545-acre Cedar River Municipal Watershed and the City's water supply and hydroelectric operations on the Cedar River. It does not include any area within the City limits. It was developed to comply with the federal Endangered Species Act and to address a variety of related natural resource issues. This plan is a set of mitigation and conservation commitments related to ongoing water supply, hydroelectric power supply, and watershed management activities for an area owned by the City outside of the City's boundaries. Because this plan covers areas outside of the City's boundaries, it is not recommended that it be referenced in the Comprehensive Plan.
3. In the early 1990s, the City adopted Creek Watershed Action Plans for Longfellow Creek and Pipers Creek. The City, the State and community members developed these plans. These plans only affect areas within the City of Seattle. The purpose these plans is to develop strategies to reduce pollutant loading from nonpoint sources, prevent new sources from being created, enhance water quality and protect beneficial uses. Development of a Watershed Action Plan for Thornton Creek began a few years ago. The Creek Watershed Plans, which apply specifically to Seattle and have been adopted by the City Council, are most appropriate for referencing in the Comprehensive Plan.
4. In 1997, the City endorsed the Lower Duwamish Watershed Habitat Restoration Plan. This plan was developed in conjunction with the State, the City of Tukwila and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. The Duwamish is a "Shoreline of Statewide Significance." This means that the area covered by the Lower Duwamish is covered by the City's Shoreline Management Program, which is included in the Comprehensive Plan. Consequently, the Comprehensive Plan currently references the Lower Duwamish plan in relation to the City's Shoreline Policies. The relationship between the City's shoreline regulations and the watershed plan presents a clear difference from the plans for the City's urban creeks.

All of these Watershed plans are action plans rather than policy plans. Their general intent is to identify a set of actions to meet identified goals, rather than to guide City policy. The City has adopted a number of other action plans. Some of these action plans are referenced in the Comprehensive Plan as "Additional Resources," including:

- Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000
- 2001-2004 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development
- Libraries for All Capital Projects
- Seattle Center 2000 Plan
- Seattle Water Supply Plan
- Seattle Comprehensive Drainage Plan; and
- "On the Path to Sustainability," the City's solid waste plan

These plans are referenced to point the reader to sources of additional information about City activities. They are not incorporated into the Plan itself and the Comprehensive Plan is silent on the consistency of these plans with the Comprehensive Plan or their weight in decision-making. Each of these plans has been adopted by the City Council by resolution (or in one case, by ordinance).

The City has three options for including the watershed plans in the Comprehensive Plan.

1. The Comprehensive Plan's Environment Element could contain a list of "Additional References", similar to the references in the Utilities and Capital Facilities Elements. These references would serve to aid the reader who wants to find out more about the City's environmental activities. Such a list of references could include any environmental action plans adopted by the City Council affecting activities within the city, including the plans for Longfellow and Pipers Creek. Under this alternative, the Comprehensive Plan would act as a reference for the reader interested in learning more about the City's environmental activities, but would not comment on the plans themselves or their relationship to the City's growth management strategy.
2. A second alternative would be to reference the fact that the City may develop plans for watersheds, and describe their relationship to the Comprehensive Plan. Under this option, individual plans would not be referenced. Instead, the City would have a policy that states that the City may work with other parties to develop plans for watersheds that are intended to identify strategies for surface water quality. Individual plans would not be referenced. This alternative would not provide the same level of information to the reader about the existing watershed plans.
3. The City could incorporate the goals of the watershed plans into the Comprehensive Plan, just as the City incorporated the goals of the neighborhood plans into the Comprehensive Plan. As with the neighborhood goals and policies, this process would require extensive outreach to the effected communities, and extensive review of the watershed plans' goals and policies in order to ensure their conformity with the legal standards regarding language included in the Comprehensive Plan. Assuming funding and staff time are available to staff such a project, new goals and/or policies could be ready for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan review process.

None of these options would necessarily increase the speed or effectiveness of the implementation of City-developed watershed plans. Implementation of any City action plan relies of community and City commitment to ensure the implementation of the plan, an ongoing commitment to fund the projects identified in the plan, and monitoring of the effectiveness of the plan's recommendations.

This type of monitoring and implementation is occurring, in both the Longfellow and Pipers creek watersheds. In 2000 a report published on implementation of the 1990 Pipers Creek Watershed Plan found, in part, that "the plan put in place in 1990 has helped to bring about significant progress in protecting and enhancing the watershed, the creek, and those amazing salmon that are now an important part of our neighborhood... the majority of the originally proposed actions has been completed." The 2000 report then identifies additional activities that would further enhance the creek's environment. Continuing the implementation and monitoring through the continued dedication of staff and fiscal resources is the best way of ensuring that the plans will be recognized and implemented.

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends incorporating a list of "Additional Resources" into the Environment Element. Include the Longfellow Creek Watershed Action Plan and the Pipers Creek Watershed Action Plan as plans that affect actions within the City limits.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

Identifying adopted watershed plans as “Additional Resources” for the reader of the Comprehensive Plan will provide additional value to the reader. Identifying them as resources does not carry any additional legal weight, nor would it require extensive City and community review to develop new policies that would be consistent with legal standards. The plans would be recognized as important information for the community and important documents to the City.

9. Capital Facilities Appendix D – Not Currently Part of the Legislation

Proposal: Amend Capital Facilities Appendix D: “Potential Future Discretionary Projects” to reflect projects that have been included in the City’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP) or other new projects.

Elements: Capital Facilities Appendix

Submitted by: Department of Finance

Description of the proposed amendment: Amend the list of potential future discretionary projects as follows:

Changes to the names of projects:

- ◆ Fire Station Upgrades and Expansions
- ◆ ~~Seattle Center Bus Barn Clean-up~~ Site Soil Remediation (Next Phase Seattle Center)

Projects to be added:

- ◆ Animal Control Shelter Expansion
- ◆ Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)
- ◆ Emergency Operations Center Replacement
- ◆ High Point*
- ◆ PC-1 Lot at Pike Place Market*

Projects to be removed:

- ◆ Aquarium Redevelopment
- ◆ Chinese Garden at South Seattle Community College
- ◆ Citywide Training Campus
- ◆ Cormorant Cove Development
- ◆ Gas Works Park Environmental Clean Up
- ◆ Holly Park Phase III
- ◆ Memorial Stadium Site Development
- ◆ Mercer Arena Renovation
- ◆ Museum of History and Industry
- ◆ Potlatch Trail
- ◆ Roy Street Shops Replacement
- ◆ Sculpture Garden at Elliott and Broad
- ◆ South Lake Union City property redevelopment

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends adopting the proposed amendments.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The proposed name changes would clarify the projects being referred to, and the potential scope of those projects.

The projects that would be removed from the Appendix are all included in the 2003-2008 Proposed Capital Improvement Program, or have commitment for other funding sources that are not included in the CIP, and no longer need to be incorporated in the Capital Facilities Appendix

as “Potential Future Discretionary Projects.” Appendix D is reserved for those projects not currently in the CIP that the City may become involved with in the future. As projects are included in the CIP, the Comprehensive Plan is generally updated.

The projects proposed to be added to the list in Appendix D are described below:

Animal Control Shelter Expansion

The potential project would expand the existing Animal Control Shelter located at 2061 15th Ave West, Seattle, WA 98119. Fleets and Facilities would be the department managing the project on behalf of the Department of Executive Administration that operates the Shelter.

Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)

The Blue Spruce is a pre-World’s Fair apartment building dating from the early 1950’s and located on the Seattle Center campus adjacent to the Seattle Center Pavilion, just south of KeyArena. This 50 year-old building is used for Seattle Center offices and offices for the Folklife and the International Children’s Festivals. The building is in very poor condition, is well past its useful life, and is inefficient for its uses. It is likely that replacement of this building and redevelopment of the site would be the most cost-effective option. Seattle Center intends to examine opportunities for partnering with a private developer, one of the Center’s tenants, and/or another public entity in redeveloping the Blue Spruce site.

Emergency Operations Center Replacement

The potential project would replace the existing Emergency Operations Center at a new location that has not been determined. Fleets and Facilities would be the department managing the project on behalf of numerous City departments and the Police Department that operates the Center.

High Point*

High Point is the latest in a series of Hope VI redevelopment projects (mostly funded by the federal department of Housing and Urban Development, but with some City funding) which are intended to rebuild and transform Seattle’s public housing garden communities. Holly Park and Rainier Vista are already underway and High Point is the most recent to receive federal funding. The Seattle Housing Authority, not the city, is in charge of these projects.

PC-1 Lot at Pike Place Market*

The potential project would redevelop the PC-1 North parking lot at the Pike Place Market. The Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority (PDA) intends to present a preferred design for the redevelopment of the PC-1 North lot in the 3rd quarter of 2003. Options for the site are focused on construction of a multi-use building to expand and supplement existing programs and space needs within the Market. The Market will be the lead on development of the project.

2002 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

ATTACHMENT A

City Council Resolution 30446, identifying proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments to be considered for possible Adoption in 2002